

Robust Asymptotic Stabilization of Nonlinear Systems with Non-Hyperbolic Zero Dynamics

L. Marconi[◦], L. Praly^{*}, A. Isidori^{◦†}

[◦] C.A.SY. – DEIS, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy.

^{*} École des Mines de Paris, Fontainebleau, France.

[†]DIS, Università di Roma “La Sapienza”, Rome, Italy.

October 2, 2008

Abstract

In this paper we present a general tool to handle the presence of zero dynamics which are asymptotically but not locally exponentially stable in problems of robust nonlinear stabilization by output feedback. We show how it is possible to design *locally Lipschitz* stabilizers under conditions which only rely upon a partial detectability assumption on the controlled plant, by obtaining a robust stabilizing paradigm which is not based on design of observers and separation principles. The main design idea comes from recent achievements in the field of output regulation and specifically in the design of nonlinear internal models.

1 Introduction

The problem of output feedback stabilization in the large for nonlinear systems has been the subject of a remarkable research attempt in the last twenty years or so (see [11]). The attempt has been initially turned to identify systematic design procedures for *state-feedback* stabilization of specific classes of nonlinear systems. To this respect it is worth mentioning the research current focused on back-stepping design procedures for lower triangular nonlinear systems with [15] for the global case and [27] for the semiglobal case. Then, the attention of the researchers shifted to the identification of partial-state and *output feedback* stabilization algorithms mainly addressed in a semi-global sense due to intrinsic limitations characterizing this class of problems (see [22]). Within the number of research directions undertaken in this field, a special role has been played by *nonlinear separation principles* based on the design of an explicit full state observer (see [28]). The main limitation of this approach is, thought, the lack of a guaranteed level of robustness of the resulting controller mainly due to the absence of a well-established theory of robust nonlinear state observers.

Furthermore, full state observability of the controlled plant is not, in principle, a necessary condition for output feedback stabilization. A step forward to overcome these limitations has been taken in [27] with the definition of Uniform Completely Observable (UCO) state-feedback control law, namely a stabilizing state dependent law which can be expressed as nonlinear function of the control input and output and their time derivatives. In this case the issue is not to estimate the full-state but rather to reproduce directly the stabilizing law through the estimation of the input-output derivatives. This, in [27], has been achieved by a mix of back-stepping and partial-state observation techniques yielding an output feedback stabilizer which is *robust* in the measure in which the UCO function does not depend on the uncertainties and the UCO control law is *vanishing* on the desired asymptotic attractor. Furthermore the *asymptotic* features of the resulting closed-loop system are subjected to the requirement that the initial state-feedback UCO-based closed-loop system is locally exponential stable. Practical stability must be accepted otherwise (see also [5] at this regard). The latter limitation may be overtaken with the design of a local nonlinear observer in the spirit of [28] by resuming again nonlinear separation principles. However, so-doing, the same limitations outlined before come out.

Exponential stability assumptions are recurrent in several contexts of nonlinear control literature while studying asymptotic behaviors of nonlinear systems. Backstepping ([7], [27]), in which the backstepped control law is usually required to exponentially stabilize the controlled dynamics, singular perturbation ([16], [30]), in which the so-called boundary layer system is required to possess an exponentially stable attractor, averaging ([24], [30]), in which exponential stability of the so-called averaged system is needed, stabilization by output feedback ([11], [27]), in which hyperbolic minimum-phase assumptions are usually required, are just a few contexts, involving problems of both synthesis and analysis of nonlinear systems, where the possibility of concluding asymptotic (and not only practical) results relies upon requirements that certain dynamics fulfill exponential stability assumptions. A particular mention must be done for the design of output feedback stabilizers for nonlinear systems which can be written in so-called normal form (see [11]). In this context exponential stability of the so-called zero dynamics (that is, hyperbolic zero dynamics) is very often a crucial pre-requisite if one is willing to address robust output feedback stabilization by means of *locally Lipschitz* regulators.

In this paper we present a tool to handle the presence of not necessarily hyperbolic zero dynamics in the stabilization of nonlinear systems by output feedback. As particular application, the tool is then used to extend the main "UCO" results presented in [27] by, so doing, overtaking the obstacle of exponential stability in the backstepping procedure and output derivatives observer design. More specifically, by means of the mathematical tools which have been developed in a context of nonlinear output regulation (see [18]), [3]), we show how the design of a dynamic output feedback control law which *asymptotically* stabilizes a compact attractor can be obtained by starting from a UCO state-feedback control law which does not necessarily stabilize in exponential way the desired asymptotic attractor and which is not necessarily vanishing on it. We will show that these limitations can be removed by means of design techniques aiming to robustly get rid of interconnections terms between

nonlinear dynamics arising in the stability analysis which are not vanishing on the desired asymptotic attractor and which, as a consequence, can not be dominated only by means of high-gain. This will lead to identify a dynamic back-stepping and an extended partial-state observer algorithms which embed solution techniques typical of internal model-based design. This work is organized as follows. In the next section the framework and the general result is given. Then, Section 3 discusses the proposed framework and solution by properly framing the result in the existing literature. Section 4, articulated in three subsections, is focused on the application of the proposed tool in the UCO context presented in [27]. Then, Section 5 presents a few conditions, obtained by mild adaptation of results proposed in the output regulation literature, useful to construct the dynamic regulator which solve the problem discussed in Section 2. Finally Section 6 and 7 concludes with an example and final remarks.

Notation For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|x|$ denotes the Euclidean norm and, for $\mathcal{C}$ a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $|x|_{\mathcal{C}} = \min_{y \in \mathcal{C}} |x - y|$ denotes the distance of x from $\mathcal{C}$. For $\mathcal{S}$ a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{cl}\mathcal{S}$ and $\text{int}\mathcal{S}$ are the closure of $\mathcal{S}$ and the interior of $\mathcal{S}$ respectively, and $\partial\mathcal{S}$ its boundary. A class- $\mathcal{KL}$ function $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfying $|s| \leq d \Rightarrow \beta(t, s) \leq Ne^{-\lambda t}|s|$ for some positive d, N, λ is said to be a locally exponential class- $\mathcal{KL}$ function. For a locally Lipschitz system of the form $\dot{z} = f(z)$ the value at time t of the solution passing through z_0 at time $t = 0$ will be written as $\phi_f(t, z_0)$ or, if the initial condition and the system are clear from the context, as $z(t)$ or $z(t, z_0)$. For a smooth system $\dot{x} = f(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a compact set $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be $\text{LAS}(\mathcal{X})$ (respectively $\text{LES}(\mathcal{X})$), with $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ a compact set, if it is locally asymptotically (respectively exponentially) stable with a domain of attraction containing $\mathcal{X}$. By $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ we denote the domain of attraction of $\mathcal{A}$ if the latter is LAS/LES for a given dynamics. For a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and a differentiable real-valued function $q : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $L_f q(x)$ denote the Lie derivative at x of q along f . For a smooth system $\dot{x} = f(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the ω -limit set of a subset $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, written $\omega(B)$, is the set of all points $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for which there exists a sequence of pairs (x_k, t_k) , with $x_k \in B$ and $t_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \phi_f(t_k, x_k) = x$.

2 The framework and the main result

The main goal of this paper is to present a design tool to handle the presence of asymptotically but not necessarily exponentially stable zero dynamics in robust output-feedback stabilization problems of nonlinear systems. Although the tool we are going to present lends itself to be useful in a significant variety of control scenarios, in order to keep confined the discussion while maintaining a certain degree of generality, we focus our attention on the class of *smooth* systems of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= f(w, x, y) & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ n \geq 0 \\ \dot{y} &= \kappa Ay + B(q(w, x, y) + v) & y \in \mathbb{R}^r, \ r \geq 1 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

with measurable output

$$y_m = Cy \quad y_m \in \mathbb{R}$$

in which the linear system (A, B, C) is assumed to have relative degree r with the pair (A, C) observable, κ is a positive design parameter and v is a control input. In the previous system the variable $w \in \mathbb{R}^s$ represents an exogenous variable which is governed by

$$\dot{w} = s(w) \quad w \in W \subset \mathbb{R}^s \quad (2)$$

with W a compact set which is *invariant* for (2). As a particular case, the signals $w(t)$ generated by (2) may be constant signals, i.e. $s(w) \equiv 0$, namely constant uncertain parameters taking value in the set W and affecting the system (1). In general, the variables w can be considered as exogenous signals which, depending on the considered control scenario, may represent references to be tracked and/or disturbances to be rejected.

Remark 1 As a consequence of the fact that W is a (forward and backward) invariant set for (2), the *closed* cylinder $\mathcal{C}_{n+r} := W \times \mathbb{R}^{n+r}$ is invariant for (1),(2). Thus it is natural to regard system (1), (2) on $\mathcal{C}_{n+r}$ and endow the latter with the relative topology. This will be done from now on by referring to system (1),(2). Analogously, the dynamics described by the first n equations of (1) and by (2) will be thought as evolving on the closed set $\mathcal{C}_n := W \times \mathbb{R}^n$ which will be endowed with the relative topology. $\triangleleft$

We shall study the previous system under the following “minimum-phase” assumption.

Assumption There exist compact sets $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}_n$ which is locally asymptotically stable for the system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w} &= s(w) \\ \dot{x} &= f(w, x, 0). \end{aligned} \quad \triangleleft \quad (3)$$

Under this assumption, there exists a compact set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{C}_n$ such that $\mathcal{A} \subset \text{int}\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is LAS($\mathcal{X}$) for system (3).

In this framework we consider the output feedback stabilization problem which consists of designing a *locally Lipschitz* regulator of the form

$$\dot{\eta} = \varphi_k(\eta, y_m) \quad v = \rho_k(\eta, y_m) \quad \eta \in \mathbb{R}^\nu, \quad (4)$$

and, given arbitrary bounded sets $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ and $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{R}^\nu$, a positive κ^* , such that for all $\kappa \geq \kappa^*$ and for some $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\nu+n}$ the set $\mathcal{B} \times \{0\}$ is LAS($\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$) for the closed-loop system (1), (4).

The important point here is that φ_k and ρ_k must be locally Lipschitz. This restriction has strong practical motivations like sensitivity to noise or numeric and discrete time implementation.

The goal of the following part is to present a result regarding the solution of the robust stabilization problem formulated above. In order to ease the notation, in the following we shall drop in (1) the dependence from the variable w which, in turn, will be thought as embedded in the variable x (with the latter varying in the set $\mathcal{C}_n$). This, with a mild abuse of notation, will allow us to rewrite system (1) and (2) in the more compact form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= f(x, y) & x \in \mathcal{C}_n \subset \mathbb{R}^{s+n} \\ \dot{y} &= \kappa Ay + B(q(x, y) + v) & y \in \mathbb{R}^r \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

and system (3) as $\dot{x} = f(x, 0)$.

The existence of a locally Lipschitz regulator solving the problem at hand, will be claimed under an assumption which involves the ability of asymptotically reproducing the function $q(x(t), 0)$, where $x(t)$ is any solution of $\dot{x} = f(x, 0)$ which can be generated by taking initial conditions on $\mathcal{A}$, by means of a locally Lipschitz system properly defined. The following definition aims to formally state the required reproducibility conditions which will be then used in the forthcoming Theorem 2.

Definition 1 (*LER, rLER*). A triplet $(F(\cdot), Q(\cdot), \mathcal{A})$, where $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $Q : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth functions and $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is a compact set, is said to be Locally Exponentially Reproducible (*LER*), if there exists a compact set $\mathcal{R} \supseteq \mathcal{A}$ which is LES for $\dot{z} = F(z)$ and, for any bounded set $\mathcal{Z}$ contained in the domain of attraction of $\mathcal{R}$, there exist an integer p , locally Lipschitz functions $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $\psi : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, with ψ a complete vector field, and a locally Lipschitz function $T : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, such that

$$Q(z) + \gamma(T(z)) = 0 \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{R}, \quad (6)$$

and for all $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $z_0 \in \mathcal{Z}$ the solution $(\xi(t), z(t))$ of

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z} &= F(z) & z(0) &= z_0 \\ \dot{\xi} &= \varphi(\xi) + \psi(\xi) Q(z) & \xi(0) &= \xi_0 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

satisfies

$$|(\xi(t), z(t))|_{\text{graph } T|_{\mathcal{R}}} \leq \beta(t, |(\xi_0, z_0)|_{\text{graph } T|_{\mathcal{R}}}) \quad (8)$$

where $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a locally exponentially class- $\mathcal{KL}$ function.

Furthermore the triplet in question is said to be robustly Locally Exponentially Reproducible (*rLER*) if it is *LER* and, in addition, for all locally essentially bounded $v(t)$, for all $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $z_0 \in \mathcal{Z}$ the solution $(\xi(t), z(t))$ of

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z} &= F(z) & z(0) &= z_0 \\ \dot{\xi} &= \varphi(\xi) + \psi(\xi)[Q(z) + v(t)] & \xi(0) &= \xi_0 \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

satisfies

$$|(\xi(t), z(t))|_{\text{graph } T|_{\mathcal{R}}} \leq \beta(t, |(\xi_0, z_0)|_{\text{graph } T|_{\mathcal{R}}}) + \ell(\sup_{\tau \leq t} |v(\tau)|) \quad (10)$$

where $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a locally exponentially class- $\mathcal{KL}$ function and ℓ is a class- $\mathcal{K}$ function. $\triangleleft$

We postpone to Section 3 a broad discussion about this definition and to Section 5 the presentation of sufficient conditions for a triplet to be *rLER*.

With this definition at hand, we pass to formulate the following theorem which fixes a framework where the stabilization problem previously formulated can be solved by means of a locally Lipschitz regulator. The proof of this theorem can be found in Appendix A.

Theorem 2 *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be LAS($\mathcal{X}$) for the system $\dot{x} = f(x, 0)$ for some compact set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{C}_n$. Assume, in addition, that the triplet $(f(x, 0), q(x, 0), \mathcal{A})$ is LER. Then there exist a locally Lipschitz regulator of the form (4), a compact set $\mathcal{R} \supseteq \mathcal{A}$, a continuous function $\tau : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$, and, for any compact set $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ and $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{R}^\nu$, a positive constant κ^* , such that for all $\kappa \geq \kappa^*$ the set*

$$\text{graph } \tau \times \{0\} = \{(\eta, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^\nu \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathbb{R}^r \quad : \quad \eta = \tau(x), y = 0\} \quad (11)$$

is LES($\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$) for (5), (4) and the set

$$\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}} \times \{0\} = \{(\eta, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^\nu \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}^r \quad : \quad \eta = \tau(x), y = 0\} \quad (12)$$

is LAS($\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$) for (5), (4). Furthermore, if $\mathcal{A}$ is also LES for the system $\dot{x} = f(x, 0)$, the set $\mathcal{R}$ can be taken equal to $\mathcal{A}$.

Remark 3 By going throughout the proof of the previous theorem, it turns out that the regulator (4) solving the problem at hand has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\eta} &= \varphi(\eta) - \psi(\eta)[\gamma(\eta) + \kappa B^T A y] \\ v &= \gamma(\eta) \end{aligned}$$

in which κ is a sufficiently large positive number and $(\varphi(\cdot), \psi(\cdot), \gamma(\cdot))$ are the locally Lipschitz functions which are associated to the triplet $(f(x, 0), q(x, 0), \mathcal{A})$ in the definition of local exponential reproducibility. $\triangleleft$

3 A brief digression about the problem

The structure of (1) and the associated problem, apparently very specific, are indeed recurrent in a number of control scenarios in which robust non linear stabilization is involved. We refer to Section 4.1 for the presentation of a few relevant cases where this occurs. For the time being it is interesting to note how the previous formulation presents two main peculiarities which make the problem at hand particularly challenging.

The first is that the function $q(w, x, y)$, coupling the x and y subsystem in (1), is not necessarily vanishing on the desired attractor $\mathcal{A} \times \{0\}$, namely the desired attractor $\mathcal{A} \times \{0\}$ is not necessarily forward invariant for (1) in the case $v \equiv 0$. In this respect the first crucial property required to the regulator is to be able to reproduce, through the input v , the uncertain coupling term $q(w, x, 0)$ by providing a not necessarily zero steady-state control input. This issue is intimately connected to arguments which are usually addressed in the output regulation literature (see [18], [3]), [10], [26]), in which the goal is precisely to make attractive a set, on which regulation objectives are met, which is not invariant for the open-loop system.

The second peculiarity, apparently not correlated to the previous one, relies in the fact that the set $\mathcal{A}$ is assumed to be "only" asymptotically stable for (3) and no exponential

properties are required. In this respect the study of the interconnection (1) is particularly challenging as it is not sufficient, in general, to decrease the linear asymptotic gain ([29]) between the "inputs" x and the "outputs" y of the y -subsystem (which is what one would make by increasing the value of κ since the matrix A is Hurwitz) to infer asymptotic properties in the interconnection. Indeed the presence of a not necessarily linear asymptotic gain between the "inputs" y and the "outputs" x of the x -subsystem requires a non trivial design of the input v which, intuitively, should be chosen to infer a certain locally non-Lipschitz ISS gain to the y -subsystem.

The rich available literature on nonlinear stabilization already provides successful tools to solve the problem at hand if the previous two pathologies are dropped, namely if the assumption is strengthened by asking that the set $\mathcal{A}$ is also $\text{LES}(\mathcal{X})$ for (3) and that the "coupling" term $q(w, x, y)$ is vanishing at $\mathcal{A} \times \{0\}$. As a matter of fact, under the previous conditions, it is a well-known fact that the set $\mathcal{A} \times \{0\}$, which is forward invariant for (1) with $v = 0$, can be stabilized by means of a large value of k as formalized in ([27], [2]).

In the case $\mathcal{A}$ is not exponentially stable for (3) and/or the coupling term $q(w, x, y)$ is not vanishing on the desired attractor, the problem becomes challenging and more sophisticated choices for v must be envisaged. In particular, while preserving the local Lipschitz property of the regulator, the only conclusions which can be drawn if $v \equiv 0$ is that the origin is *semiglobally practically* stable in the parameter κ , that is the trajectories of the system can be steered arbitrary close to the set $\mathcal{A} \times \{0\}$ by increasing the value of κ (see [27], [2], [18]). Even in the simpler scenario in which $q(w, x, 0) \equiv 0$ for all $(w, x) \in \mathcal{A}$, a large value of k is not sufficient to enforce the desired asymptotic behavior in the case the set $\mathcal{A}$ fails to be exponentially stable for (3). In this case the asymptotic properties of the system have been studied in [5] by showing how the trajectories are attracted by a manifold which, only in a particular case depending on the linear approximation of the system, collapses to the origin (see Theorem 6.2 in [5]).

In these critical scenarios an appropriate design of the control input v becomes inevitable in order to compensate for the coupling term $q(w, x, y)$ which cannot be only dominated by a large value of κ . In particular, a first possible option, motivated by small gain arguments and gain assignment procedures for nonlinear systems (see [14], [13]), is to design the control v in order to assign, to the y -subsystem, a certain nonlinear ISS gain suitably identified according to small gain criterions and to the asymptotic gain of the x -subsystem (1). This option, however, necessarily leads to design control laws which are not, in general, locally Lipschitz close to the compact attractor and, thus, which violates a basic requirement of the above problem.

An alternative option to design the control v is to be inspired by nonlinear separation principles (see, besides others, [27], [28], [2], [11], [8]), namely to design an appropriate state observer yielding an asymptotic estimate $(\hat{w}, \hat{x}, \hat{y})$ of the state variables, and to asymptotically compensate for the coupling term $q(w, x, y)$ by implementing a "certainty equivalence" control law of the form $v = -q(\hat{w}, \hat{x}, \hat{y})$. Indeed, under suitable conditions, the tools proposed in [28] would allow one to precisely fix the details and to solve the problem at hand in a

rigorous way. This way of approaching the problem, though, presents a number of drawbacks which substantially limit its applicability. First, the design of the observer clearly requires the formulation of suitable observability assumptions¹ on the controlled plant, and in particular of its (w, x) components, not in principle necessary for the stabilization problem to be solvable, which may be not fulfilled for a number of relevant cases. Moreover, according to the state-of-the-art of the observer design literature ([8]), the design of the observer may be a challenging (if not impossible) task in case of uncertain parameters affecting the observed dynamics. Finally, it is worth noting how approaching the problem according to the previous design philosophy, leads to inherently *redundant control structures*, by requiring the explicit estimate of the full state (and of possible uncertainties) in order to reproduce the signal $q(w, x, y)$.

As opposite to the previous strategies, Theorem 2 provides a design procedure which does not rely upon domination of the interconnection term $q(w, x, y)$ but rather on its asymptotic reconstruction which, however, it is not based upon the design of an observer of the state variables (w, x, y) . In this respect the crucial property underlying the Theorem is the local exponential reproducibility property which, according to its definition, relies upon two requirements. The key first requirement, for a triplet $(F, Q, \mathcal{A})$ to be LER, is that there exists a set $\mathcal{R}$ which contains $\mathcal{A}$ and which is LES for the autonomous system $\dot{z} = F(z)$. The second crucial requirement characterizing the definition is that there exists a *locally Lipschitz* system of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\xi} &= \varphi(\xi) + \psi(\xi)u_\xi \\ y_\xi &= \gamma(\xi)\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

with input u_ξ and output y_ξ , such that system (7), modelling the cascade connection of the autonomous system $\dot{z} = F(z)$ with output $y_z = Q(z)$ with the system (13), has a locally exponentially stable set described by graph $T|_{\mathcal{R}}$ and, on this set, the output y_ξ equals y_z (see (6)). The domain of attraction of graph $T|_{\mathcal{R}}$ is required to be of the form $\mathcal{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ with $\mathcal{Z}$ any compact set in the domain of attraction of $\mathcal{R}$ (note that, according to the definition, system (13) is allowed to depend on the choice of $\mathcal{Z}$). In this respect the second requirement can be regarded as the ability, of the system (13), of *asymptotically reproducing* the output function $Q(z(t))$ of system $\dot{z}(t) = F(z(t))$ with initial conditions of the latter taken in $\mathcal{Z}$. Note how the "output reproducibility" property required to system (13) does not hide, in principle, any kind of state observability property of the system $\dot{z} = F(z)$ with output $y_z = Q(z)$. In other words system (13) must be not confused with a state observer of the z -subsystem as its role is to reproduce the output function $Q(z(t))$ and not necessarily to estimate its state.

As the definition of *robust* LER, we only note that, in addition to the previous properties, it is required that system (9) exhibits an ISS property (without any special requirement on the asymptotic gain) with respect to the exogenous input v .

¹It must be noted that only *local* observability notion are potentially needed at this level as a consequence of the fact that practical stability is already guaranteed by the high-gain law κ .

4 Applications

4.1 Output-feedback from UCO state-feedback in presence of non-hyperbolic attractors

In this part we show how the theory of robust nonlinear separation principle presented in [27], [2] can be extended with the tools developed in the previous sections. In particular we are interested to extend the theory of [27] by showing how to design a pure output-feedback semiglobal controller stabilizing an attractor when it is known how the latter can be asymptotically (*but not exponentially*) stabilized by means of a Uniform Completely Observable (UCO) state-feedback controller.

Consider the smooth system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w} &= s(w) & w &\in W \subset \mathbb{R}^s \\ \dot{z} &= A(w, z, u) & z &\in \mathbb{R}^m, u \in \mathbb{R} \\ y &= C(w, z) & y &\in \mathbb{R} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

in which u and y are respectively the control input and the measured output and W is a compact set which is invariant for $\dot{w} = s(w)$. As discussed in the previous section, the variables w emphasize the possible presence of parametric uncertainties and/or disturbance to be rejected and/or reference to be tracked (in the latter case the measurable output y plays more likely the role of regulation/tracking error). As done before, in order to simplify the notation, we drop the dependence of the variable w and we compact system (14) in the more convenient form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z} &= A(z, u) & z &\in \mathbb{R}^m, u \in \mathbb{R} \\ y &= C(z) & y &\in \mathbb{R} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

which is supposed to evolve on a closed invariant set $\mathcal{C}_m$ which is endowed with the subset topology (such a closed set being, in the form (14), the closed cylinder $\mathcal{C}_m := W \times \mathbb{R}^m$).

We recall (see [27]) that a function $\bar{u} : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be UCO with respect to (15) if there exist two integers n_y, n_u and a $\mathcal{C}^1$ function Ψ such that, for each solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z} &= A(z, u_0) \\ \dot{u}_i &= u_{i+1} & i &= 0, \dots, n_u - 1 \\ \dot{u}_{n_u} &= v \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

we have, for all t where the solution makes sense,

$$\bar{u}(z(t)) = \Psi(y(t), y^{(1)}(t), \dots, y^{(n_y)}(t), u_0(t), \dots, u_{n_u}(t)) \quad (17)$$

where $y^{(i)}(t)$ denotes the i th derivative of y at time t .

Motivated by [27] we shall study system (15) under the following two assumptions:

- a) there exist a smooth function $\bar{u} : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and compact sets $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}_m$ and $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{C}_m$, such that the $\mathcal{A}$ is LAS($\mathcal{Z}$) for system (15) with $u = \bar{u}(z)$;²
- b) $\bar{u}(z)$ is UCO with respect to (15).

In this framework we shall be able to prove, under suitable reproducibility conditions specified later, that the previous two assumptions imply the existence of a locally Lipschitz dynamic output feedback regulator able to asymptotically stabilize the set $\mathcal{A}$. The main theorem in this direction is detailed next. In this theorem we refer to an integer $\ell_u \geq n_u$ defined as that number such that for the system

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{z} &= A(z, \xi_0) \\ \dot{\xi}_0 &= \xi_1 \\ &\vdots \\ \dot{\xi}_{\ell_u} &= u_1,\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

there exist smooth functions C_i such that the first $n_y + 1$ time derivatives of y can be expressed as

$$y^{(i)} = C_i(z, \xi_0, \dots, \xi_{\ell_u}) \quad \forall i = 0, \dots, n_y + 1.$$

Theorem 4 *Consider system (15) and assume the existence of a compact set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}_m$ and of a smooth function $\bar{u}(z)$ such that properties (a) and (b) specified above are satisfied. Assume, in addition, that the triplets*

$$(A(z, \bar{u}(z)), L_{A(z, \bar{u}(z))}^{(\ell_u+1)} \bar{u}(z), \mathcal{A})\tag{19}$$

and

$$(A(z, \bar{u}(z)), L_{A(z, \bar{u}(z))}^{(n_y+1)} C(z), \mathcal{A})\tag{20}$$

are $r\text{LER}$. Then there exist a positive σ , a compact set $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^o$ and, for any $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{R}^o$, a locally Lipschitz controller of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\zeta} &= \Phi(\zeta, y) \\ u &= \Upsilon(\zeta, y)\end{aligned} \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^o\tag{21}$$

such that the set $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ is LAS($\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{N}$) for the closed-loop system (15), (21).

This result extends Theorem 1.1 of [27] in three directions. First, note that we are dealing with stabilization of compact attractors for systems evolving on *closed sets*. This is a technical improvement on which, though, we would not like to put the emphasis. Second, note that the UCO control law $\bar{u}(z)$ is not required to be vanishing on the attractor $\mathcal{A}$ which, as a consequence, is not required to be forward invariant for the open loop system

²By referring to (14), a meaningful case to be considered is when $\mathcal{A} = W \times \{0\}$, in which case this assumption amounts to require the existence of a state feedback stabilizer, possibly dependent on the uncertainties, able to asymptotically stabilize the origin with a certain domain of attraction.

(15) with $u \equiv 0$. In this respect the proposed setting can be seen as also able to frame output regulation problems. Finally, the previous result claims that, by means of a pure *locally Lipschitz* output feedback controller, we are able to restore the asymptotic properties of an UCO controller without relying upon exponential stability requirements of the latter and robustly with respect to uncertain parameters. The last two extensions are conceptually very much relevant and can be seen as particular application of the tools presented in the previous sections. Following the main laying of [27], the proof of the claim is divided in two subsections which contain results interesting on their own.

4.2 Robust Asymptotic Backstepping

In this part we discuss how the UCO control law $\bar{u}$ can be robustly back-step through the chain of integrators of (16). As commented above, the forthcoming proposition extends in a not trivial way the results of [27] in the measure in which one considers the fact that $\bar{u}(z)$ is not vanishing on the attractor and that $\mathcal{A}$ is not necessarily locally exponential stable for the closed-loop system.

We show that the existence of the static UCO stabilizer for (15) implies the existence of a dynamic stabilizer for (18) using the partial state ξ_i , $i = 0, \dots, \ell_u$, and the output derivatives $y^{(i)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n_y$. This is formally proved in the next proposition.

Proposition 1 *Consider system (18) under the assumption (a) previously formulated. Assume that the triplet (19) is rLER. Then there exists a positive ν , a compact set $\mathcal{R} \supset \mathcal{A}$, a continuous function $\tau : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\nu+\ell_u+1}$, and, for any compact set $\Xi' \subset \mathbb{R}^{\ell_u+1}$ and $\mathcal{N}' \subset \mathbb{R}^\nu$, a locally Lipschitz regulator of the form*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\eta} &= \varphi(\eta, \xi, \bar{u}(z)) & \eta &\in \mathbb{R}^\nu \\ u_1 &= \rho(\eta, \xi, \bar{u}(z)), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

with $\xi = \text{col}(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{\ell_u})$ such that the sets

$$\text{graph } \tau := \{(z, \xi, \eta) \in \mathcal{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{\ell_u+1} \times \mathbb{R}^\nu : (\xi, \eta) = \tau(z)\} \quad (23)$$

and

$$\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}} := \{(z, \xi, \eta) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}^{\ell_u+1} \times \mathbb{R}^\nu : (\xi, \eta) = \tau(z)\}$$

are respectively $LES(\mathcal{Z} \times \Xi' \times \mathcal{N}')$ and $LAS(\mathcal{Z} \times \Xi' \times \mathcal{N}')$ for the closed-loop system (18), (22).

Proof. Consider the change of variables

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_0 &\rightarrow \tilde{\xi}_0 &:=& \xi_0 - \bar{u}(z) \\ \xi_i &\rightarrow \tilde{\xi}_i &:=& \xi_i - \bar{u}^{(i)}(z, \tilde{\xi}_0, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_{i-1}) \quad i = 1, \dots, \ell_u \end{aligned}$$

where the $\bar{u}^{(i)}(z)$, $i = 1, \dots, \ell_u$, are recursively defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{u}^{(1)}(z, \tilde{\xi}_0) &:= \frac{\partial \bar{u}(z)}{\partial z} A(z, \tilde{\xi}_0 + \bar{u}(z)) \\ \bar{u}^{(i)}(z, \tilde{\xi}_0, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_{i-1}) &:= \frac{\partial \bar{u}^{(i-1)}(z, \tilde{\xi}_0, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_{i-2})}{\partial z} A(z, \tilde{\xi}_0 + \bar{u}(z)) + \\ &\quad \sum_{j=0}^{i-2} \frac{\partial \bar{u}^{(i-1)}(z, \tilde{\xi}_0, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_{i-2})}{\partial \tilde{\xi}_j} \tilde{\xi}_{j+1} \quad i = 2, \dots, \ell_u,\end{aligned}$$

and the further change of variable

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\xi}_i &\rightarrow \zeta_i := g^{-i} \tilde{\xi}_i \quad i = 0, \dots, \ell_u - 1 \\ \tilde{\xi}_{\ell_u} &\rightarrow \zeta_{\ell_u} := \tilde{\xi}_{\ell_u} - \sum_{i=0}^{\ell_u-1} a_i g^{\ell_u-i} \tilde{\xi}_i\end{aligned}$$

where g is a positive design parameter and the a_i 's are coefficients of an Hurwitz polynomial.

By letting $\zeta := \text{col}(\zeta_0, \dots, \zeta_{\ell_u-1})$ system (18) in the new coordinates reads as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{z} &= A(z, \bar{u}(z)) + \tilde{A}(z, C\zeta) \\ \dot{\zeta} &= gH\zeta + B\zeta_{\ell_u} \\ \dot{\zeta}_{\ell_u} &= u_1 + \ell_g(z, \zeta, \zeta_{\ell_u})\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where $B = \text{col}(0, \dots, 0, 1)$, $C = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, $\tilde{A}(z, C\zeta) = A(z, \tilde{\xi}_0 + \bar{u}(z)) - A(z, \bar{u}(z))$, H is a Hurwitz matrix and $\ell_g(\cdot)$ is a smooth function such that

$$\ell_g(z, 0, 0) = -L_{A(z, \bar{u}(z))}^{(\ell_u+1)} \bar{u}(z) \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{25}$$

As the triplet (19) is rLER, there exists a compact set $\mathcal{R} \supseteq \mathcal{A}$ which is LES for $\dot{z} = A(z, \bar{u}(z))$ with $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{R}) \supseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$. Furthermore, by the fact that (19) is rLER and by definition of rLER, also the triplet $(A(z, \bar{u}(z)), -L_{A(z, \bar{u}(z))}^{(\ell_u+1)} \bar{u}(z), \mathcal{R})$ is rLER. We consider now the zero dynamics, with respect to the input u_1 and output ζ_{ℓ_u} , of system (24) given by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{z} &= A(z, \bar{u}(z)) + \tilde{A}(z, C\zeta) \\ \dot{\zeta} &= gH\zeta\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

For this system it can be proved (by means of arguments which, for instance, can be found in [18]), that for any compact set $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell_u}$ there exists a $g^* > 0$ such that for all $g \geq g^*$ the sets $\mathcal{R} \times \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{A} \times \{0\}$ are respectively LES($\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{M}$) and LAS($\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{M}$) for (26). Fix, once for all, $g \geq g^*$. By the previous facts, by (25), by the fact that the triplet $(A(z, \bar{u}(z)), -L_{A(z, \bar{u}(z))}^{(\ell_u+1)} \bar{u}(z), \mathcal{R})$ is rLER, and by Proposition 6 in Appendix B, it follows that the triplet $((26), \ell_g(z, \zeta, 0), \mathcal{R} \times \{0\})$ is LER. Now fix

$$u_1 = -\kappa \zeta_{\ell_u} + v \tag{27}$$

where κ is a positive design parameters and v is a residual control input. From the previous results, it follows that system (24) with (27) fits in the framework of Theorem 2, by which it is possible to conclude that there exists a locally Lipschitz controller of the form

$$\dot{\xi} = \Phi'_k(\xi, \zeta_{\ell_u}) \quad v = \Upsilon'_k(\xi, \zeta_{\ell_u}) \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^p, \quad (28)$$

a continuous function $\tau' : \mathcal{R} \times \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and, for any compact set $\mathcal{M}_{\ell_u} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{N}' \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, a positive constant κ^* , such that for all $\kappa \geq \kappa^*$ the set

$$\text{graph } \tau' \times \{0\} = \{((z, \zeta), \zeta_{\ell_u}, \xi) \in (\mathcal{R} \times \{0\}) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p \quad : \quad \zeta_{\ell_u} = 0, \xi = \tau'(z, \zeta)\}$$

is $\text{LES}(\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}_{\ell_u} \times \mathcal{N}')$ for (24), (27) and (28). Furthermore, by properly adapting the arguments at the end of the proof of Theorem 2, it is possible also to prove that the set $\text{graph } \tau'|_{\mathcal{A} \times \{0\}} \times \{0\}$ is $\text{LAS}(\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}_{\ell_u} \times \mathcal{N}')$ for (24), (27) and (28).

The previous facts have shown how to solve the problem at hand by means of a *partial state feedback* regulator (namely a regulator processing $\tilde{\xi}_0 = \xi_0 - \bar{u}(z)$ and its first ℓ_u time derivatives $\tilde{\xi}_i$) of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\xi} &= \Phi'_k(\xi, \zeta_{\ell_u}) \\ u_1 &= -\kappa \zeta_{\ell_u} + \Upsilon'_k(\xi, \zeta_{\ell_u}) \quad \zeta_{\ell_u} = \tilde{\xi}_{\ell_u} - \sum_{i=0}^{\ell_u-1} a_i g^{\ell_u-1} \tilde{\xi}_i. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

In order to obtain a pure output feedback regulator of the form (22), we follow [27] and design a "dirty derivatives" observer-based regulator

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{\xi}}_i &= \tilde{\xi}_{i+1} + L^{i+1} \lambda_i (\tilde{\xi}_0 - \tilde{\xi}_0) \quad i = 0, \dots, \ell_u - 1 \\ \dot{\tilde{\xi}}_{\ell_u} &= L^{\ell_u+1} \lambda_r (\tilde{\xi}_0 - \tilde{\xi}_0) \\ \dot{\xi} &= \Phi'_k(\xi, \hat{\zeta}_{\text{sat}}) \\ u &= -\kappa \hat{\zeta}_{\text{sat}} + \Upsilon'_k(\xi, \hat{\zeta}_{\text{sat}}) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where L is a positive design parameters, the λ_i 's are such that the polynomial $s^{\ell_u} + \lambda_{\ell_u} s^{\ell_u-1} + \dots + \lambda_2 s + \lambda_1$ is Hurwitz and where

$$\hat{\zeta}_{\text{sat}} = \text{sat}_{\ell}(\tilde{\xi}_{\ell_u} - g^{\ell_u-1} a_0 \tilde{\xi}_1 - \dots - g a_{\ell_u-1} \tilde{\xi}_{\ell_u-1})$$

in which $\text{sat}_{\ell}(s)$ is the saturation function such that $\text{sat}_{\ell}(s) = s$ if $|s| \leq \ell$ and $\text{sat}_{\ell}(s) = \ell \text{sgn}(s)$ otherwise. Letting $\tilde{\xi} = \text{col}(\tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_{\ell_u})$, $\hat{\xi} = \text{col}(\hat{\xi}_1, \dots, \hat{\xi}_{\ell_u})$, and defining the change of variables

$$\tilde{\xi} \mapsto e := D_L(\tilde{\xi} - \hat{\xi})$$

in which $D_L = \text{diag}(L^{\ell_u-1}, \dots, L, 1)$, it turns out that the overall closed-loop system (24), (30) reads as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \varphi(x) + \Delta_1(x, e) \\ \dot{e} &= L H e + \Delta_2(x, e) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where $x := \text{col}(z, \zeta, \zeta_{\ell_u}, \xi)$, $\dot{x} = \varphi(x)$ is a compact representation of (24), (29), H is a Hurwitz matrix and $\Delta_1(\cdot)$ and $\Delta_2(\cdot)$ are defined as

$$\Delta_1(\cdot) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \kappa(\zeta_{\ell_u} - \hat{\zeta}_{\text{sat}}) + \Upsilon'_k(\xi, \hat{\zeta}_{\text{sat}}) - \Upsilon'_k(\xi, \zeta_{\ell_u}) \\ \Phi'_k(\xi, \hat{\zeta}_{\text{sat}}) - \Phi'_k(\xi, \zeta_{\ell_u}) \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\Delta_2(\cdot) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \kappa(\zeta_{\ell_u} - \hat{\zeta}_{\text{sat}}) + \Upsilon'_k(\xi, \hat{\zeta}_{\text{sat}}) - \Upsilon'_k(\xi, \zeta_{\ell_u}) \end{pmatrix}$$

By construction the set $\text{graph}\tau' \times \{0\}$ is $\text{LES}(\mathcal{X})$ for the system $\dot{x} = \varphi(x)$ with $\mathcal{X} := (\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{M}) \times \mathcal{M}_{\ell_u} \times \mathcal{N}'$ and, by construction, it turns out that for any $\ell > 0$, $\Delta_1(x, 0) \equiv 0$ and $\Delta_2(x, 0) \equiv 0$ for all $x \in \text{graph}\tau' \times \{0\}$. Furthermore, for any compact $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell_u-1}$, $\mathcal{M}_{\ell_u} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell_u}$, there exists a compact set $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\ell_u}$ (dependent on L) such that if $\zeta(0) \in \mathcal{M}$, $\zeta_{\ell_u} \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell_u}$ and $\hat{\xi}(0) \in \hat{\mathcal{M}}$ then $e(0) \in \mathcal{E}$. Furthermore, by definition of saturation function, it turns out that for all $\bar{x} > 0$ there exist $\delta_1 > 0$ and $\delta_2 > 0$ such that $|\Delta_1(x, e)| \leq \delta_1$ and $\Delta_2(x, e) \leq \delta_2$ for all x , $|x| \leq \bar{x}$, $e \in \mathbb{R}$ and $L > 0$.

From these facts and by the result in [27], it follows that for any $\mathcal{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell_u}$ there exists a $L^* > 0$ such that for all $L \geq L^*$ the set

$$\text{graph}\tau' \times \{0\} \times \{0\} = \{((z, \zeta), \zeta_{\ell_u}, \xi, e) \in (\mathcal{R} \times \{0\}) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^{\ell_u} : \zeta_{\ell_u} = 0, \xi = \tau'(z, \zeta), e = 0\}$$

is $\text{LES}(\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}_{\ell_u} \times \mathcal{N}' \times \mathcal{E})$.

From the previous results, the fact that $\mathcal{A}$ is LAS for the system $\dot{z} = A(z, \bar{u}(z))$, and the fact that on $\text{graph}\tau' \times \{0\} \times \{0\}$ the closed-loop dynamics is described by $\dot{z} = A(z, \bar{u}(z))$, the desired result follows by properly adapting the omega-limit set arguments used at the end of the proof of Theorem 2.

◁

4.3 Extended Dirty Derivatives Observer

In this part we present a result which allows one to obtain a pure output feedback stabilizer once a partial state-feedback stabilizer (namely a stabilizer processing the output and a certain number of its time derivative) is known. Along the lines pioneered in [6] and [27], the idea is to substitute the knowledge of the time derivatives of the output with appropriate estimates provided by a "dirty derivative observer" (by using the terminology of [27]). In our context, though, we propose an "extended" dirty derivative observer, where the adjective "extended" is to emphasize the presence of a dynamic extension of the classical observer structure motivated by the need of handling the presence of possible not exponentially stable

attractors in the partial-state feedback loop and the fact that, on this attractor, the measured output is not necessarily vanishing.

More specifically we assume, for the system (15), the existence of a dynamic stabilizer of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\varsigma} &= \bar{\varphi}(\varsigma, y, y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(n_y)}) \quad \varsigma \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ u &= \bar{\rho}(\varsigma, y, y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(n_y)})\end{aligned}\tag{32}$$

such that the following property hold for the closed-loop system:

- a) there exists a compact set $\mathcal{R} \supset \mathcal{A}$ and a continuous function $\tau : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that the sets $\text{graph}\tau$ and $\text{graph}\tau|_{\mathcal{A}}$ are respectively $\text{LES}(\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{H})$ and $\text{LAS}(\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{H})$ for the closed-loop system (15), (32) for some compact set $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$;
- b) there exist smooth functions $C_i, i = 0, \dots, n_y + 1$, such that the output derivatives $y^{(i)}$ of the closed-loop system (15), (32) can be expressed as $y^{(i)} = C_i(z, \varsigma), i = 0, \dots, n_y + 1$ and the following holds

$$\bar{\rho}(\varsigma, y, y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(n_y)})|_{\text{graph}\tau} = \bar{u}(z).$$

Remark 5 Note that the previous conditions are automatically satisfied under the assumptions of Section 4.1 and by virtue of the results presented in the previous section. As a matter of fact, by bearing in mind (18) and Theorem 1 (and specifically (22)), the main outcome of the previous Section has been to design a dynamic controller of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\xi}_0 &= \xi_1 \\ &\vdots \\ \dot{\xi}_{\ell_u} &= \rho(\eta, \xi, \bar{u}(z)) \\ \dot{\eta} &= \varphi(\eta, \xi, \bar{u}(z)) \\ u &= \xi_0\end{aligned}\tag{33}$$

in which, according to (17) and to the definition of ℓ_u ,

$$\bar{u}(z) = \Psi(y, y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(n_y)}, \xi_0, \dots, \xi_{n_y}).\tag{34}$$

System (33), (34) is clearly in the form (32) and, according to the result of Theorem 1, the previous conditions (a)-(b) are satisfied. $\triangleleft$

Within the previous framework we are able to prove the following proposition which, along with Proposition 1 and the previous remark, immediately yields Theorem 4.

Proposition 2 *Consider system (15) and assume the existence of a dynamic regulator of the form (32) such that the previous properties (a)-(b) are satisfied. Assume, in addition, that the triplet (20) is rLER. Then there exist a positive ϵ , a compact set $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^o$ and, for any compact set $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{R}^o$, an output feedback controller of the form (21) such that the set $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ is LAS($\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{N}$) for the closed-loop system (15), (21).*

Proof. As candidate controller, we consider a system of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\varsigma} &= \bar{\varphi}_\ell(\varsigma, y, \hat{y}_1, \dots, \hat{y}_{n_y}) \\ \dot{\hat{y}}_i &= \hat{y}_{i+1} + L^{i+1} \lambda_i (\hat{y}_0 - y) \\ \dot{\hat{y}}_{n_y} &= L^{n_y+1} \lambda_{n_y} (\hat{y}_0 - y) + v \\ u &= \bar{\rho}_\ell(\varsigma, y, \hat{y}_1, \dots, \hat{y}_{n_y})\end{aligned}$$

in which v is a control input to be designed, L is a positive design parameters, the λ_i 's are the coefficients of an Hurwitz polynomial and $\bar{\varphi}_\ell(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\rho}_\ell$ are appropriate saturated versions of the functions $\bar{\varphi}(\cdot)$ and $\bar{\rho}(\cdot)$ of (32) satisfying $\bar{\varphi}_\ell(s) = \bar{\varphi}(s)$ if $|\bar{\varphi}(s)| \leq \ell$, $|\bar{\varphi}_\ell(s)| \leq \ell$ for all s , and $\bar{\rho}_\ell(s) = \bar{\rho}(s)$ if $|\bar{\rho}(s)| \leq \ell$, $|\bar{\rho}_\ell(s)| \leq \ell$ for all s , with ℓ a design parameter.

Let now $y_d = \text{col}(y, y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(n_y)})$, $\hat{y} = \text{col}(\hat{y}_0, \hat{y}_1, \dots, \hat{y}_{n_y})$ and consider the change of variables $\hat{y} \mapsto e = D_L(y_d - \hat{y})$ where $D_L = \text{diag}(L^{n_y}, L^{n_y-1}, \dots, 1)$. In this coordinate setting, by denoting $x = \text{col}(z \ \varsigma)$, the overall closed-loop system reads as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= f(x) + \Delta(x, e) \\ \dot{e} &= LHe + B(q(x) + v)\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

in which H is a Hurwitz matrix in observability canonical form, $B = (0 \ \dots \ 0 \ 1)^T$ $\dot{x} = f(x)$ is a compact representation of the system (15), (32), $q(x) = C_{n_y+1}(z, \varsigma)$ and

$$\Delta(x, e) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ A(z, \bar{\rho}_\ell(\varsigma, y, \hat{y}_1, \dots, \hat{y}_{n_y})) - A(z, \bar{\rho}(\varsigma, y, y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(n_y)})) \\ \bar{\varphi}_\ell(\varsigma, y, \hat{y}_1, \dots, \hat{y}_{n_y}) - \bar{\varphi}(\varsigma, y, y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(n_y)}) \end{pmatrix}$$

in which, in the latter, we have left the "original" coordinates $\hat{y}_i$ for notational convenience.

By definition of Δ , of $\bar{\rho}_\ell$ and of $\bar{\varphi}_\ell$, it turns out that for any bounded set $\mathcal{Z}'_M$ and $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathbb{R}^{p+\nu}$, there exists an ℓ^* such that for any $\ell \geq \ell^*$

$$\Delta(x, 0) = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{Z}'_M \times \mathcal{H}.$$

Furthermore, by the fact that the triplet (20) is rLER it follows that there exists a compact set $\mathcal{R}' \supset \mathcal{A}$ which is LES for $\dot{z} = A(z, \bar{u}(z))$ with $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{R}') \supseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$. Let $\mathcal{R}'' := \mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{R}'$. By item (a) above and by going throughout the proof of Proposition 1, it turns out that $\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{R}''}$ is LES for $\dot{x} = f(x)$. Moreover, the set $\mathcal{R}''$ is LES for $\dot{z} = A(z, \bar{u}(z))$ with $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{R}'') \supseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ and, by definition of rLER, it is possible to claim that the triplet $(A(z, \bar{u}(z)), L_{A(z, \bar{u}(z))}^{(n_y+1)} C(z), \mathcal{R}'')$ is rLER. From the previous facts, from the item (b) above, which implies that

$$q(x)|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{R}''}} = C_{n_y+1}(z, \tau(z)) = L_{A(z, \bar{u}(z))}^{(n_y+1)} C(z),$$

and by Proposition 6 in Appendix B, it follows that the triplet

$$(f(x), q(x), \text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{R}''})$$

is LER. Thus system (35) fits in the framework of Theorem 2 (with $\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{R}''}$ playing the role of the set $\mathcal{A}$) by which the result follows (by using the fact that $\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is LAS for $\dot{x} = f(x)$ and by adapting the omega-limit set arguments at the end of the proof of Theorem 2). $\triangleleft$

$\triangleleft$

5 Sufficient conditions for exponential reproducibility

Having established with Theorems 2 and 4 the interest of local exponential reproducibility for solving the problem of (robust) output feedback stabilization via a locally Lipschitz regulator, in this section we present a number of results which are useful to test when a triplet $(F, Q, \mathcal{A})$ is rLER (and thus LER) and, eventually, to design the functions (φ, ψ, γ) .

As also commented in Section 5, the first requirement behind the definition is the existence of a compact set $\mathcal{R} \supseteq \mathcal{A}$ which is LES for $\dot{z} = F(z)$. In this respect we present a result which claims that the existence of a set $\mathcal{R}$ which is LES for $\dot{z} = F(z)$ is automatically guaranteed if the set $\mathcal{A}$ is LAS for $\dot{z} = F(z)$. Thus, put in the context of Theorem 2, the first requirement of the definition is not restrictive at all. Details of this fact are reported in the following proposition whose proof can be found in [20].

Lemma 1 *Consider system*

$$\dot{z} = F(z) \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^m \quad (36)$$

evolving on an invariant closed set $\mathcal{C}_m \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}_m$ be a compact set which is LAS with domain of attraction $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_m$. For any compact set $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{C}_m$ such that $\mathcal{A} \subset \text{int}\mathcal{S}$, there exists a compact set $\mathcal{R}$ satisfying $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{S}$ which is LES for (36) with domain of attraction $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{R}) \equiv \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$.

We pass now to analyze the second crucial requirement behind the definition of rLER, namely the existence of *locally Lipschitz* functions (φ, ψ, γ) and T such that conditions (6) and (10) are satisfied for system (9). Being the property in question related to the ability of reproducing any signal $Q(z(t))$ generated by the system $\dot{z}(t) = F(z(t))$ by taking its initial conditions in the set $\mathcal{R}$, it is not surprising that the theory of nonlinear output regulation, and specifically the design techniques proposed in the related literature to construct internal models, can be successfully used to this purpose (see [17]). In particular, in the following, we present two techniques which are directly taken, with minor adaptations, from the literature of output regulation.

First, we follow [4] and we present a method which draws its inspiration from high-gain design techniques of nonlinear observers. Specifically it is possible to state the following proposition which comes from Lemma 1 and from minor adaptations³ of the main result of [4] (see the quoted work for the proof).

³The adaptation consists only in proving the ISS property which is behind the definition of rLER.

Proposition 3 Let $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $Q : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given smooth functions and $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ be a given compact set which is LAS for $\dot{z} = F(z)$. Assume, in addition, that there exist a $\tilde{m} > 0$, a compact set $\mathcal{S}$ such that $\mathcal{A} \subset \text{int}\mathcal{S}$ and a locally Lipschitz function $f : \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{m}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the following differential equation holds

$$L_{F(z)}^{\tilde{m}} Q(z) = f(Q(z), L_{F(z)} Q(z), \dots, L_{F(z)}^{\tilde{m}-1} Q(z)) \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (37)$$

Then the triplet $(F, Q, \mathcal{A})$ is rLER. In particular (φ, ψ, γ) can be taken as the functions $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{m}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{m}}$, $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{m}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{m}}$, $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{m}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$\varphi(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_2 + \lambda_0 L \xi_1 \\ \xi_3 + \lambda_1 L^2 \xi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \xi_{\tilde{m}} + \lambda_{\tilde{m}-2} L^{\tilde{m}-1} \xi_1 \\ f_c(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{\tilde{m}}) + \lambda_{\tilde{m}-1} L^{\tilde{m}} \xi_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda_0 L \\ -\lambda_1 L^2 \\ \vdots \\ -\lambda_{\tilde{m}-2} L^{\tilde{m}-1} \\ -\lambda_{\tilde{m}-1} L^{\tilde{m}} \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\gamma(\xi) = \xi_1$, where L is a positive design parameter to be taken sufficiently large, λ_i , $i = 0, \dots, \tilde{m} - 1$, are such the polynomial $s^{\tilde{m}} + \lambda_{\tilde{m}-1} s^{\tilde{m}-1} + \dots + \lambda_1 s + \lambda_0$ is Hurwitz, and $f_c(\cdot)$ is any bounded function such that $f_c \circ \tau(z) = f(z)$ for all $z \in \mathcal{S}$ where $\tau : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{m}}$ is defined as

$$\tau(z) = \begin{pmatrix} Q(z) & L_{F(z)} Q(z) & \cdots & L_{F(z)}^{\tilde{m}-1} Q(z) \end{pmatrix}^T.$$

Remark 6 It is well-known (see, for instance, [8]) that a sufficient condition for a pair (F, Q) to satisfy property (37) locally with respect to a point z_0 is that its observability distribution at z_0 (see [9])

$$\Omega_m(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \text{span} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} L_{F(z)}^k Q(z) \quad (38)$$

has dimension m at $z = z_0$, namely if the system $\dot{z} = F(z)$ with output $y_z = Q(z)$ satisfies the *observability rank condition* (by using the terminology of [9]) at z_0 . Such a condition represents an observability condition for the system $\dot{z} = F(z)$ with output $y_z = Q(z)$ which, however, is far to be necessary to fulfill the property of rLER. In this respect it must be stressed again that the property of local exponential reproducibility does not involve any state observability property of system $\dot{z} = F(z)$ with output $y_z = Q(z)$ but rather a property of output reproducibility. $\triangleleft$

Clearly the high-gain technique to design output observer behind Proposition 3 is not the only tool which can be used to design the functions (φ, ψ, γ) for a triplet which is rLER. In order to enrich the available tools, we present now a result motivated by the theory of state observers pioneered in [23] (and developed in [1], [25]) which, in turn, has inspired the technique to design internal models developed in [18] in the context of nonlinear output regulation (see also [21]). In this respect it is interesting to observe that if instead of asking (φ, ψ, γ) to be locally Lipschitz these functions were required to be only continuous, the

theoretical tools presented in [18] are sufficient to prove that any smooth triplet $(F, Q, \mathcal{A})$ is rLER if $\mathcal{A}$ is LAS for $\dot{z} = F(z)$. In particular, if $(H, G) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} \times \mathbb{R}^{p \times 1}$, $p > 0$, is an arbitrary controllable pair with H a Hurwitz matrix, and $\mathcal{R}$ is the set which is LES for $\dot{z} = F(z)$ (whose existence is guaranteed by Lemma 1 since $\mathcal{A}$ is LAS for these dynamics), then it turns out that if the functions φ and ψ in (9) are chosen as

$$\varphi(\xi) = H\xi \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(\xi) = G$$

then property (10) holds true with (see Propositions 1 in [18])

$$T(z) = \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{-Ht} G Q(\Phi_F(t, z)) dt. \quad (39)$$

Furthermore, if p is chosen so that $p \geq 2m + 2$ and the matrix H is taken so that $\sigma(H) \in \{\zeta \in \mathcal{C} : \Re(\zeta) < -\ell\} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ where $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{C}$ is a set of zero Lebesgue measure and ℓ is a sufficiently large positive number, then there always exists a class- $\mathcal{K}$ function $\rho(\cdot)$ such that the following partial injectivity condition

$$|T(z_1) - T(z_2)| \leq \rho(|Q(z_1) - Q(z_2)|) \quad \forall z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{R} \quad (40)$$

holds (see Proposition 2 in [18]) and, in turn, the latter guarantees the existence of a *continuous* function $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that also property (6) holds true (see Proposition 3 in [18]). As shown in [21] (see Proposition 4 there), a possible expression of such a $\gamma(\cdot)$ is given by

$$\gamma(\xi) = \inf_{z \in \mathcal{R}} \{-Q(z) + \rho(|\xi - T(z)|)\}. \quad (41)$$

The previous arguments, however, are not conclusive if system (13) is required to be locally Lipschitz. In this respect an extra condition (see the forthcoming (42), (43)) is needed to guarantee the existence of a locally Lipschitz γ as precisely proved in [12]. The main results in this direction are presented in the next lemma (whose proof is a minor adaptation of the main result of [12]).

Proposition 4 *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an open bounded set which is backward invariant for $\dot{z} = F(z)$ with $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ a smooth function. Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{O}$ be a compact set which is LAS for $\dot{z} = F(z)$ and let $Q : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^∞ function. Let $\Omega(z)$ be the distribution defined as*

$$\Omega(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \text{span} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} L_{F(z)}^k Q(z). \quad (42)$$

If there exists a constant $c \leq m$ such that

$$\dim \Omega(z) = c \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{O} \quad (43)$$

then for any compact set $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{O}$, with $\mathcal{R} \supseteq \mathcal{A}$, the function ρ in (40) can be taken linear and the function γ in (41) is Locally Lipschitz. As a consequence the triplet $(F, Q, \mathcal{A})$ is rLER.

Remark 7 By also bearing in mind Remark 6, it is worth noting how condition (43) *does not* require the observability distribution (38) to be full rank, namely the system $\dot{z} = F(z)$ with output $y_z = Q(z)$ to be observable in any sense. Rather, condition (43) can be regarded as a regularity condition of the observable part of system $\dot{z} = F(z)$ with output $y_z = Q(z)$. $\triangleleft$

Remark 8 By going throughout the technical details in [12], it is possible to observe that the requirement about the existence of an open bounded set $\mathcal{O}$ which is *backward invariant* for $\dot{z} = F(z)$ is *uniquely* motivated by the need of having the function $T(z)$ in (39) well-defined and C^2 . In this respect the requirement about the existence of a bounded invariant set $\mathcal{O}$ can be substituted by the requirement that the function $T(z)$ in (39) is well-defined and C^2 for all $z \in \text{int}\mathcal{R}$ for a proper choice of the matrix H . In this case, by the details in [12], it turns out that the rank condition (43) must be substituted by

$$\dim\Omega(z) = c \quad \forall z \in \{\Phi_F(t, \varsigma) \quad : \quad t \leq 0, \varsigma \in \mathcal{R}\}. \triangleleft$$

Remark 9 The requirement in Lemma 4 about the existence of a bounded set $\mathcal{O}$ which is backward invariant for $\dot{z} = F(z)$, may be practically overtaken by properly "clipping" the function $F(z)$ outside the set $\mathcal{A}$. As a matter of fact, being the property of rLER related to the ability of reproducing the signals $Q(z(t))$ generated by the system $\dot{z}(t) = F(z(t))$ by taking its initial conditions in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{A}$, it turns out that any triplet $(F_c, Q_c, \mathcal{A})$, with $F_c : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $Q_c : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ functions which agree with F and Q on some compact $\mathcal{S}$ containing $\mathcal{A}$ in its interior, can be used in place of $(F, Q, \mathcal{A})$ to check whether the latter is rLER and eventually to design the functions (φ, ψ, γ) . In this respect, the presence of a bounded backward invariant set $\mathcal{O}$ may be forced by properly clipping to zero the vector field $F(z)$ outside $\mathcal{A}$. Alternatively, by bearing the previous remark, the function T be forced to be well-defined and C^2 by properly clipping the function $Q(z)$ outside $\mathcal{A}$. For reason of space we omit the technical details to rigorously prove the previous intuition and we refer the reader to the example in Section 6 for an illustrative example.

6 Example

Consider the system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w} &= 0 \\ \dot{x} &= -x^3 + w + y \\ \dot{y} &= x + u \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

with control input $u \in \mathbb{R}$, measured output $y \in \mathbb{R}$ in which w is a constant signal taking value in the interval $W := [\underline{w}, \overline{w}]$. By defining $\mathcal{C}_1 := W \times \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\mathcal{A} := \{(w, x) \in \mathcal{C}_1 \quad : \quad x = \sqrt[3]{w}\}$$

we address the problem of stabilizing the set $\mathcal{A} \times \{0\}$, which is invariant for the previous system with $u = 0$, by means of a y -feedback. The set $\mathcal{A}$ is LAS for the zero dynamics

of (44) with domain of attraction $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{C}_1$ and, by defining $u = -\kappa y + v$, the previous problem fits in the framework of Section 2. Note, in particular, that by only increasing the value of k while setting $v = 0$ the desired asymptotic stabilization objective can not be met. As a matter of fact, different equilibria characterize the system according to the value of w . For $w = 0$, the y -component of the system has three equilibria given by $(0, \sqrt{1/\kappa^3}, -\sqrt{1/\kappa^3})$ which, for $w \neq 0$, collapse in one equilibrium, solution of $w + y = \kappa^3 y^3$, which tends to 0 as k tends to ∞ . So, with $v = 0$, only *practical* stabilization of the set $\mathcal{A} \times \{0\}$ in the parameter k can be achieved. In order to apply Theorem 2 and to obtain asymptotic stabilization of the set $\mathcal{A} \times \{0\}$ by means of dynamic feedback, we let $z := \text{col}(w, x)$,

$$F(z) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -x^3 + w \end{pmatrix} \quad Q(z) := x$$

and we check the exponential reproducibility of the triplet $(F(z), Q(z), \mathcal{A})$. To this purpose, let $\mathcal{S}$ be a compact set of the form

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(w, x) \in \mathcal{C}_1 : \sqrt[3]{w} - \frac{1}{2} \leq x \leq \sqrt[3]{w} + \frac{1}{2}\}$$

so that $\mathcal{A} \subset \text{int}\mathcal{S}$, and note that, by Lemma 1, there exists a set $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{R} \subset \text{int}\mathcal{S}$, which is LER with $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$. Both Proposition 3 and 4 can be used to prove that the triplet in question is rLER and, indeed, to design the functions (φ, ψ, γ) .

By following Proposition 3, it is easy to check that

$$L_{F(z)}^2 Q(z) = -3 Q^2(z) L_{F(z)} Q(z) \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{C}_1,$$

namely condition (37) holds (with $\tilde{m} = 2$), and thus the triplet $(F(z), Q(z), \mathcal{A})$ is rLER. According to the proposition, the functions (φ, ψ, γ) can be designed as

$$\varphi(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_2 + \lambda_0 L \xi_1 \\ f_c(\xi_1, \xi_2) + \lambda_1 L^2 \xi_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \psi(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda_0 L \\ -\lambda_1 L^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \gamma(\xi) = \xi_1 \quad (45)$$

where λ_0 and λ_1 are such that $s^2 + \lambda_1 s + \lambda_0$ is an Hurwitz polynomial, L is a sufficiently large design parameter and $f_c(\cdot)$ is any smooth bounded function such that

$$f_c(x, -x^3 + w) = -3x^2(-x^3 + w) \quad \forall (x, w) \in \mathcal{S}.$$

The functions (φ, ψ, γ) can be designed according to Proposition 4 as well. However note that this proposition cannot be applied as such due to the absence of a bounded invariant set containing $\mathcal{A}$ (indeed finite escape time occur in backward time for initial conditions outside $\mathcal{A}$). To overtake this obstacle and by bearing in mind Remark 9, pick a smooth function $a : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $a(s) = 1$ for all $\sqrt[3]{w} - \frac{1}{2} \leq s \leq \sqrt[3]{w} + \frac{1}{2}$ and $a(s) = 0$ for all $s \leq \sqrt[3]{w} - 1$ and $s \geq \sqrt[3]{w} + 1$, and consider the system $\dot{z} = a(x)F(z)$. For this system the bounded set $\mathcal{O}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{O} = \{z \in \mathcal{C}_1 : \sqrt[3]{w} - 1 \leq x \leq \sqrt[3]{w} + 1\},$$

which is open with respect to the subset topology induced by $\mathcal{C}_1$, is invariant. Thus, Lemma 4 can be applied to the triplet $(a(x)F(z), Q(z), \mathcal{A})$. In this specific case

$$\Omega(z) = \text{span} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ a(x) & * \end{pmatrix}$$

where $*$ is a junk term, from which it follows that

$$\dim \Omega(z) \equiv 2 \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{O}$$

which implies, by Proposition 4, that the triplet $(a(x)F(z), Q(z), \mathcal{A})$ is rLER. But, as the functions $F(z)$ and $a(x)F(z)$ agree on $\mathcal{S}$, the fact that the triplet $(a(x)F(z), Q(z), \mathcal{A})$ is rLER can be shown to imply that also the triplet $(a(x)F(z), Q(z), \mathcal{A})$ is such. Thus, according to Proposition 4, the functions (φ, ψ, γ) can be also designed as

$$\varphi(\xi) = H\xi, \quad \psi(\xi) = G, \quad \gamma(\xi) = \inf_{z \in \mathcal{R}} \{-Q(z) + \rho \cdot |\xi - T(z)|\} \quad (46)$$

where $(H, G) \in \mathbb{R}^{5 \times 5} \times \mathbb{R}^{5 \times 1}$ is an arbitrary controllable pair with the matrix H such that $\sigma(H) \in \{\zeta \in \mathcal{C} : \Re(\zeta) < -\ell\} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ where $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{C}$ is a set of zero Lebesgue measure and ℓ is a sufficiently large positive number, the function T defined as in (39) and ρ a sufficiently large positive number.

As a result the problem of output feedback stabilization of the set $\mathcal{A} \times \{0\}$ can be achieved, by bearing in mind Theorem 2 and the subsequent remark, by the following dynamic controller

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\xi} &= \varphi(\xi) - \psi(\xi)[\gamma(\xi) - \kappa y] \\ u &= -\kappa y + \gamma(\xi) \end{aligned}$$

with the functions (φ, ψ, γ) designed as in (45) or (46) and κ a sufficiently large number.

A Proof of Theorem 2

By the definition of LER of the triplet $(f(x, 0), q(x, 0), \mathcal{A})$ there exists a set $\mathcal{R} \supseteq \mathcal{A}$ which is LES for $\dot{x} = f(x, 0)$ and, for any compact set $\mathcal{X}_1 \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{R})$, there exist an integer ν , locally Lipschitz functions $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^\nu \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$, $\psi : \mathbb{R}^\nu \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$, $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^\nu \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a smooth function $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$ such that

$$q(x, 0) + \gamma(T(x)) = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{R} \quad (47)$$

and for all $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}_1$ the solution $(\xi(t), x(t))$ of

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= f(x, 0) & x(0) &= x_0 \\ \dot{\xi} &= \varphi(\xi) + \psi(\xi)q(x, 0) & \xi(0) &= \xi_0 \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

satisfies

$$|(\xi(t), x(t))|_{\text{graph } T|_{\mathcal{R}}} \leq \beta(t, |(\xi_0, x_0)|_{\text{graph } T|_{\mathcal{R}}}) \quad (49)$$

where $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a locally exponentially class- $\mathcal{KL}$ function. As $\mathcal{A}$ is $\text{LAS}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathcal{R} \supseteq \mathcal{A}$, we have $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ and thus the previous properties hold, in particular, with $\mathcal{X}_1 = \mathcal{X}$. Furthermore, in case $\mathcal{A}$ is LES for $\dot{x} = f(x, 0)$, it is possible to show⁴ that (47) and (49) hold also with $\mathcal{R}$ replaced by $\mathcal{A}$ possibly with a different class- $\mathcal{KL}$ function $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$.

Assume, without loss of generality (as (A, B, C) has relative degree r and (A, C) is observable), that the pair (A, C) is in the canonical observability form and that $B = (0, \dots, 0, 1)^T$, and choose, as candidate controller, the system

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\eta} &= \varphi(\eta) - \psi(\eta)\gamma(\eta) - \psi(\eta)\kappa B^T A y \\ v &= \gamma(\eta)\end{aligned}\tag{50}$$

which, by the structure of A and B , is of the form (4) since $B^T A y = a_r y_m$ for some real number a_r .

Consider now the change of variables

$$\eta \rightarrow \chi := \phi_\psi(B^T y, \eta).\tag{51}$$

Note that such a change of variables is well-defined for all y and η as ψ is complete.

Since

$$\frac{\partial \phi_\psi(t', \eta)}{\partial t'} - \frac{\partial \phi_\psi(t', \eta)}{\partial \eta} \psi(\eta) \equiv 0$$

and using the fact that

$$\left. \frac{\partial \phi_\psi(t', \eta)}{\partial t'} \right|_{t'=0} = \psi(\eta) \quad \left. \frac{\partial \phi_\psi(t', \eta)}{\partial \eta} \right|_{t'=0} = I,$$

it turns out that the closed-loop dynamics (1), (50) in the new coordinates can be described as the feedback interconnection of a system of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= f(x, 0) + \tilde{f}(x, y) \\ \dot{\chi} &= \varphi(\chi) + \psi(\chi)q(x, 0) + \tilde{\ell}_1(x, \chi, y)\end{aligned}\tag{52}$$

and a system of the form

$$\dot{y} = \kappa A y + B(q(x, 0) + \gamma(\chi)) + \tilde{\ell}_2(x, \chi, y)\tag{53}$$

in which $\tilde{f}(x, y)$, $\tilde{\ell}_1(x, \chi, y)$ and $\tilde{\ell}_2(x, \chi, y)$ are *locally Lipschitz* functions satisfying $\tilde{f}(x, 0) = 0$, $\tilde{\ell}_1(x, \chi, 0) = 0$ and $\tilde{\ell}_2(x, \chi, 0) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\chi \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ and with $\tilde{\ell}_1$ and $\tilde{\ell}_2$ possibly dependent on $\mathcal{X}$.

Let $\mathcal{N}$ be an arbitrary compact set of $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ and denote by Ξ the image of $\mathcal{N}$ under the function (51) (note that $\mathcal{N}$ may depend on $\mathcal{X}$). Since system (52) with $y = 0$ is nothing but (48), it turns out that $\text{graph } T|_{\mathcal{R}}$ is $\text{LES}(\mathcal{X} \times \Xi)$ for system (52) with $y = 0$. Furthermore, by (47), the term $q(x, 0) + \gamma(\chi)$ in (53) is identically zero for $(x, \chi) \in \text{graph } T|_{\mathcal{R}}$. From these

⁴Internal remark: to be checked.

facts and the results in [27], [2], it follows that for any compact set $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^r$ there exists a $\kappa^* > 0$ such that for all $\kappa \geq \kappa^*$ the set $\text{graph } T|_{\mathcal{R}} \times \{0\}$ is $\text{LES}(\mathcal{X} \times \Xi \times \mathcal{Y})$ for (52), (53). By taking $\tau = T|_{\mathcal{R}}$ the previous result proves the first part of the theorem, namely that $\text{graph } \tau \times \{0\}$ is $\text{LES}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{N})$ for the closed-loop system (1), (50).

We prove now the second claim of the theorem, namely that $\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}} \times \{0\}$ is $\text{LAS}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{N})$. Let $\kappa \geq \kappa^*$ be fixed and note that, as $\text{graph } \tau \times \{0\}$ attracts uniformly the closed-loop trajectories leaving $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{N}$, Proposition 5 yields that

$$\omega(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{N}) = \omega(\text{graph } \tau \times \{0\}) \subseteq \text{graph } \tau \times \{0\}$$

in which $\omega(S)$ denotes the omega limit set of the set S associated to the closed-loop system. We prove now that if $(x, y, \chi) \in \omega(\text{graph } \tau \times \{0\})$ then necessarily $x \in \omega(\mathcal{R})$ in which $\omega(\mathcal{R})$ denotes the omega limit set of the set $\mathcal{R}$ associated to the system $\dot{x} = f(x, 0)$.

Indeed, consider a sequence $\{x_n, y_n, \chi_n\}$ with $(x_n, \chi_n) \in \text{graph } \tau$ and so in particular $x_n \in \mathcal{R}$, and $y_n \equiv 0$, and a divergent sequence $\{t_n\}$, such that, the following holds

$$|x(t_n, x_n) - \bar{x}| \rightarrow 0, \quad (54)$$

where $x(t, x_n)$ and $\chi((x_n, \chi_n), t)$ denotes the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= f(x, 0) \\ \dot{\chi} &= \varphi(\chi) + \psi(\chi)q(x, 0) \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

with initial conditions (x_n, χ_n) . x_n being in $\mathcal{R}$, this implies $\bar{x} \in \omega(\mathcal{R})$. Now, considering the system given by the first dynamics in (55) and using the fact that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ uniform attracts the trajectories of this system leaving $\mathcal{X}$, Proposition 5 in Appendix yields that $\omega(\mathcal{X}) = \omega(\mathcal{R}) = \omega(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. By this and the previous arguments we conclude that the x components of the closed-loop trajectories are uniformly attracted by $\omega(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. From this the result follows by standard arguments. $\triangleleft$

B Auxiliary results

Proposition 5 *Let*

$$\dot{z} = F(z) \quad (56)$$

be a given smooth system and let S be a compact set which is forward invariant for (56) and which uniformly (in the initial condition) attracts the trajectories of (56) originating in a compact set $D \supset S$. Then $\omega(D) = \omega(S) \subseteq S$.

Proof First of all note that $\omega(D)$ and $\omega(S)$ exist and that, by definition, $\omega(S) \subseteq \omega(D)$. Furthermore $\omega(S) \subseteq S$ as S is forward invariant for (56). To prove that $\omega(D) = \omega(S)$ suppose that it is not, namely that there exist a $\bar{z} \in \omega(D)$ and an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $|\bar{z}|_S \geq \epsilon$. As S uniformly attracts the trajectories of (56) originating from D , there exists a $t_{\epsilon/2} > 0$ such that $|z(t, z_0)|_S \leq \epsilon/2$ for all $z_0 \in D$ and for all $t \geq t_{\epsilon/2}$. Moreover, by definition of

$\omega(D)$, there exist sequences $\{z_n\}_0^\infty$ and $\{t_n\}_0^\infty$, with $z_n \in D$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = \infty$, such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z(t_n, z_n) = \bar{z}$. This, in particular, implies that for any $\nu > 0$ there exists a $n_\nu > 0$ such that $|z(t_n, z_n) - \bar{z}| \leq \nu$ for all $n \geq n_\nu$. But, by taking $\nu = \min\{\epsilon/2, \nu_1\}$ with ν_1 such that $t_n \geq t_{\epsilon/2}$ for all $n \geq n_{\nu_1}$, this contradicts that S uniformly attracts the trajectories of the system originating from D . $\triangleleft$

Proposition 6 *Consider a system of the form*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= f_1(x_1, x_2) & x_1 &\in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \\ \dot{x}_2 &= f_2(x_1, x_2) & x_2 &\in \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

and assume that there exist a compact set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ and a smooth function $\tau : \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ such that the set

$$\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}} = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2} : x_2 = \tau(x_1)\}$$

is LES for (57) and the set $\mathcal{A}$ is LES for the system $\dot{x}_1 = f_1(x_1, \tau(x_1))$. Let $q : \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function. If the triplet $(f_1(x_1, \tau(x_1)), q(x_1, \tau(x_1)), \mathcal{A})$ is rLER then the triplet $(\text{col}(f_1(x_1, x_2), f_2(x_1, x_2)), q(x_1, x_2), \text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}})$ is LER.

Proof. Let $\bar{f}_1(x_1) = f_1(x_1, \tau(x_1))$ and $\bar{q}(x_1) = q(x_1, \tau(x_1))$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is LES for $\dot{x}_1 = \bar{f}_1(x_1)$ and the triplet $(\bar{f}_1(x_1), \bar{q}(x_1), \mathcal{A})$ is rLER, for any compact set $\bar{X}_1 \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$, there exist an integer $\bar{p}$ and locally Lipschitz functions $\bar{\varphi} : \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}$, $\bar{\psi} : \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\bar{\gamma} : \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\bar{T} : \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}$ such that, for all $\bar{x}_{10} \in \bar{X}_1$ and $\bar{\xi}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}$ and for all locally essentially bounded $v(t)$, the solution $(\bar{x}_1(t), \bar{\xi}(t))$ of the system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\bar{x}}_1 &= \bar{f}_1(\bar{x}_1) & \bar{x}_1(0) &= \bar{x}_{10} \\ \dot{\bar{\xi}} &= \bar{\varphi}(\bar{\xi}) + \bar{\psi}(\bar{\xi})[\bar{q}(\bar{x}_1) + v] & \bar{\xi}(0) &= \bar{\xi}_0 \end{aligned}$$

satisfies

$$|(\bar{x}_1(t), \bar{\xi}(t))|_{\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}} \leq \beta_1(t, |(\bar{x}_{10}, \bar{\xi}_0)|_{\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}}) + \ell(\sup_{\tau \leq t} |v(\tau)|) \quad (58)$$

where $\beta_1(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\ell(\cdot)$ are respectively a locally exponential class- $\mathcal{KL}$ and a class- $\mathcal{K}$ functions, and

$$\bar{\gamma}(\bar{T}(\bar{x}_1)) + \bar{q}(\bar{x}_1) = 0 \quad \forall \bar{x}_1 \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Furthermore, by the assumption that $\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is LES for (57), for any $(x_{10}, x_{20}) \in \mathcal{D}(\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}})$ the solution $(x_1(t), x_2(t))$ of (57) with initial condition $(x_1(0), x_2(0)) = (x_{10}, x_{20})$ satisfies

$$|(x_1(t), x_2(t))|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}} \leq \beta_2(t, |(x_{10}, x_{20})|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}}) \quad (59)$$

where $\beta_2(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a locally exponential class- $\mathcal{KL}$ function.

Now pick a compact set $\bar{X}_1 \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ and the functions $(\bar{\varphi}(\cdot), \bar{\psi}(\cdot), \bar{\gamma}(\cdot))$ accordingly, and denote by $(x_1(t), x_2(t), \xi(t))$ the solution of the system

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_1 &= f_1(x_1, x_2) & x_1 &\in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \\
\dot{x}_2 &= f_2(x_1, x_2) & x_2 &\in \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \\
\dot{\xi} &= \bar{\varphi}(\xi) + \bar{\psi}(\xi)q(x_1, x_2) & \xi &\in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

with initial conditions $(x_{10}, x_{20}, \xi_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \times \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}$ at time $t = 0$. Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ be an arbitrary compact set such that $X \subset \mathcal{D}(\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}})$, let $\mathcal{R} := \text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}$ and let $T : \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}$ be the locally Lipschitz function defined as $T(x_1, x_2) = \bar{T}(x_1)$. We shall prove in the following that for any initial condition $(x_{10}, x_{20}, \xi_0) \in X \times \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}$ the trajectory $(x_1(t), x_2(t), \xi(t))$ of (60) satisfies

$$|(x_1(t), x_2(t), \xi(t))|_{\text{graph } T|_{\mathcal{R}}} \leq \beta_3(t, |(x_{10}, x_{20}, \xi_0)|_{\text{graph } T|_{\mathcal{R}}}) \tag{61}$$

where $\beta_3(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a locally exponential class- $\mathcal{KL}$ function and

$$\text{graph } T|_{\mathcal{R}} = \{((x_1, x_2), \xi) \in \text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}} : \xi = T(x_1, x_2)\}.$$

To this purpose, pick any $\bar{x}_{10} \in \mathcal{A} \subset \bar{X}_1$ and note that $(x_1(t), x_2(t), \xi(t))$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_1(t) &= f_1(x_1(t), x_2(t)) & x_1(0) &= x_{10} \\
\dot{x}_2(t) &= f_2(x_1(t), x_2(t)) & x_2(0) &= x_{20} \\
\dot{\xi}(t) &= \bar{\varphi}(\xi(t)) + \bar{\psi}(\xi(t))[\bar{q}(\bar{x}_1(t)) + v(t)] & \xi(0) &= \xi_0
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where

$$v(t) = q(x_1(t), x_2(t)) - \bar{q}(\bar{x}_1(t))$$

and $\bar{x}_1(t) = \Phi_{\bar{f}_1}(t, \bar{x}_{10})$. Let $x_1^* \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that $(x_1^*, \tau(x_1^*))$ is the projection of (x_1, x_2) on $\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}$. Since $\bar{x}_1(t) \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x_1^*(t) \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $t \geq 0$, X is compact and (59) holds, and $\bar{q}$ is locally Lipschitz, for any initial condition $(x_{10}, x_{20}) \in X$ of (62) the term $v(t)$ can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
|v(t)| &= |q(x_1(t), x_2(t)) - \bar{q}(x_1^*(t)) + \bar{q}(x_1^*(t)) - \bar{q}(\bar{x}_1(t))| \\
&\leq |q(x_1(t), x_2(t)) - \bar{q}(x_1^*(t))| + |\bar{q}(x_1^*(t)) - \bar{q}(\bar{x}_1(t))| \\
&\leq L_q |(x_1(t), x_2(t))|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}} + 2 \sup_{s \in \mathcal{A}} |\bar{q}(s)| \\
&\leq v_M
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \geq 0$, where L_q is a bound of the Lipschitz constant of q on the forward flow of (57) originated from X and v_M a positive constant, both dependent on X . Hence, from estimate (58), it follows that $|(\bar{x}_1(t), \xi(t))|_{\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}}$ is bounded and, since $\bar{x}_1(t) \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is compact, also $\xi(t)$ is bounded. This, in turn, implies that also the trajectories of (60) originated from $X \times \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}$ are ultimately bounded, namely there exists a compact set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2+\bar{p}}$ such that for any $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}$ there exists a $T > 0$ such that $\forall (x_{10}, x_{20}, \xi_0) \in X \times \Xi$, $(x_1(t), x_2(t), \xi(t)) \in S$ for all $t \geq T$. As a consequence, the trajectories of (60) are uniformly attracted by $\omega(S)$, the ω -limit set of the set S of system (60), which is a bounded invariant set.

We prove now that $\omega(S)$ is a subset of $\text{graph } T|_{\mathcal{R}}$. For, let $(x'_{10}, x'_{20}, \xi'_0)$ be a point of $\omega(S)$ and note that, by (59) which implies that $\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is uniform attractive for the (x_1, x_2) dynamics in (60), and by Proposition 5 in Appendix B, it turns out that necessarily $x'_{10} \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x'_{20} = \tau(x'_{10})$. Furthermore it can be proved that $\xi'_0 = \bar{T}(x'_{10})$. In fact, suppose that it is not true, namely that there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$|(x'_{10}, \xi'_0)|_{\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}} \geq \epsilon. \quad (63)$$

As $\omega(S)$ is invariant for (60), for any $(x_{10}, x_{20}, \xi_0) \in \omega(S)$ the corresponding trajectory $(x_1(t), x_2(t), \xi(t)) \in \omega(S)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and thus $x_1(t) \in \mathcal{A} \subset \bar{X}_1$ and $x_2(t) = \tau(x_1(t)) \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$. So, inequality (58) with $v = 0$ yields that, using compactness of $\omega(S)$, there exists a $t_\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $(x_{10}, x_{20}, \xi_0) \in \omega(S)$, $|(x_1(t), \xi(t))|_{\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}} < \epsilon/2$ for all $t \geq t_\epsilon$. The previous facts, specialized with $(x_{10}, x_{20}, \xi_0) = \Phi_{(60)}(-t_\epsilon, (x'_{10}, x'_{20}, \xi'_0))$, yield that $(x'_{10}, x'_{20}, \xi'_0) = \Phi_{(60)}(t_\epsilon, (x_{10}, x_{20}, \xi_0))$ are such that $|(x'_{10}, \xi'_0)|_{\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}} < \epsilon/2$ which contradicts (63). Hence, $\omega(S)$ is necessarily a subset of $\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}$. Since S can be taken, without loss of generality, such that $\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}} \subset \text{int} S$, the previous facts prove (61) with the only exception that the class $\mathcal{KL}$ function $\beta_3(\cdot, \cdot)$ is not necessarily locally exponential (see [3]). To prove local exponential stability we follow a Lyapunov approach. First, note that, by defining $p_1 = \text{col}(x_1, \xi)$, the first and third dynamics of (60) can be rewritten as

$$\dot{p}_1 = F_1(p_1) + G_1(p_1, x_2)(x_2 - \tau(x_1))$$

where $F_1(p_1) = \text{col}(\bar{f}_1(x_1), \bar{\phi}(\xi)\bar{\psi}(\xi)\bar{q}_1(x_1))$, $G_1(p_1, x_2) = \text{col}(r_1(x_1, x_2), \bar{\psi}(\xi)r_2(x_1, x_2))$ in which $r_1(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $r_2(\cdot, \cdot)$ are properly defined smooth functions. By assumption and by standard converse Lyapunov results, there exist a smooth function $V_1 : \mathcal{D}(\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and positive numbers $c_1, \underline{a}_1 \leq \bar{a}_1$, such that

$$\frac{\partial V_1(p_1)}{\partial p_1} F_1(p_1) \leq -c_1 V_1(p_1) \quad \forall p_1 \in \mathcal{D}(\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}) \quad (64)$$

and

$$\underline{a}_1 |p_1|_{\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}}^2 \leq V_1(p_1) \leq \bar{a}_1 |p_1|_{\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}}^2 \quad \forall p_1 : (x_1, x_2, \xi) \in S. \quad (65)$$

Similarly, by letting $p_2 = \text{col}(x_1, x_2)$ and by rewriting (57) as $\dot{p}_2 = F_2(p_2)$, it turns out that there exist a smooth function $V_2 : \mathcal{D}(\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and positive numbers $c_2, \underline{a}_2 \leq \bar{a}_2$, such that

$$\frac{\partial V_2(p_2)}{\partial p_2} F_2(p_2) \leq -c_2 V_2(p_2) \quad \forall p_2 \in \mathcal{D}(\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}) \quad (66)$$

and

$$\underline{a}_2 |p_2|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}}^2 \leq V_2(p_2) \leq \bar{a}_2 |p_2|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}}^2 \quad \forall p_2 : (x_1, x_2, \xi) \in S. \quad (67)$$

Furthermore, note that there exists a positive $\bar{\tau}$ such that

$$|x_2 - \tau(x_1)| \leq \bar{\tau} |(x_1, x_2)|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}} \quad \forall (x_1, x_2) : (x_1, x_2, \xi) \in S. \quad (68)$$

As a matter of fact, given $(x_1, x_2, \xi) \in S$, let $\bar{x}_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that $|x_1 - \bar{x}_1, x_2 - \tau(\bar{x}_1)| = |(x_1, x_2)|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}}$. As $|x_1 - \bar{x}_1| \leq |(x_1, x_2)|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}}$ and $|x_2 - \tau(\bar{x}_1)| \leq |(x_1, x_2)|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}}$, and denoting by $\bar{\tau}'$ an upper bound of the Lipschitz constant of τ on S , it turns out that

$$\begin{aligned} |x_2 - \tau(x_1)| &= |x_2 - \tau(\bar{x}_1) + \tau(\bar{x}_1) - \tau(x_1)| \\ &\leq |x_2 - \tau(\bar{x}_1)| + |\tau(\bar{x}_1) - \tau(x_1)| \\ &\leq |(x_1, x_2)|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}} + \bar{\tau}'|x_1 - \bar{x}_1| \\ &\leq (1 + \bar{\tau}')|(x_1, x_2)|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}} := \bar{\tau}|(x_1, x_2)|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}} \end{aligned}$$

for all $(x_1, x_2, \xi) \in S$, namely (68) holds. Consider now the candidate Lyapunov function $V(x_1, x_2, \xi) = V_1(p_1) + \beta V_2(p_2)$ for system (60) with $\beta > 0$. By (65) and (67), there exist positive numbers $\underline{a} \leq \bar{a}$ (dependent on β) such that

$$\underline{a}|(x_1, \xi)|_{\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}}^2 + \underline{a}|(x_1, x_2)|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}}^2 \leq V(x_1, x_2, \xi) \leq \bar{a}|(x_1, \xi)|_{\text{graph } \bar{T}|_{\mathcal{A}}}^2 + \bar{a}|(x_1, x_2)|_{\text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}}}^2$$

By (64), (66), (67) and (68), and by the fact that $G_1(p_1)$ is locally Lipschitz, it turns out that there exists a $\beta^* > 0$ such that for all $\beta \geq \beta^*$ and for all $(x_1, x_2, \xi) \in S$

$$\dot{V}(x_1, x_2, \xi) \Big|_{(60)} \leq -c V(x_1, x_2, \xi)$$

where c is a positive constant. Combining the previous facts with by (59), standard arguments yields (61) with $\beta_3(\cdot, \cdot)$ a locally exponential class-KL function. This, in turn, proves the proposition with the functions (φ, ψ, γ) associated to the triplet $(\text{col}(f_1(x_1, x_2), f_2(x_1, x_2)), q(x_1, x_2), \text{graph } \tau|_{\mathcal{A}})$ in the definition of LER given by $(\bar{\varphi}, \bar{\psi}, \bar{\gamma})$. $\triangleleft$

References

- [1] V. Andrieu and L. Praly, On the existence of a Kazantis-Kravaris/Luenberger observer. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, Vol. 45, n. 2, pp. 432-456, 2006.
- [2] A.N. Atassi and H.K. Khalil, A separation principle for the stabilization of a class of nonlinear systems. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, Vol. 44, pp. 1672- 1687, September 1999.
- [3] C.I. Byrnes, A. Isidori, Limit sets, zero dynamics and internal models in the problem of nonlinear output regulation. IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control, **AC-48**, pp. 1712-1723, (2003).
- [4] C.I. Byrnes, A. Isidori, Nonlinear internal models for output regulation. IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control, 49 (2004), pp. 2244-2247.
- [5] C. I. Byrnes and F. Celani and A. Isidori, Omega-limit sets for a class of nonlinear systems that are semiglobally practically stabilized. Int. J. of Robust and Nonl. Cont., 15, pp. 315-333, 2005.

- [6] F. Esfandiari and H. Khalil, Output feedback stabilization of fully linearizable systems, *International Journal of Control*, 56 (1992), pp. 1007–1037.
- [7] R. Freeman, P. Kokotović, *Robust nonlinear control design : State-space and Lyapunov techniques*. Birkhäuser. 1996.
- [8] J.P. Gauthier and I. Kupka, *Deterministic Observation Theory and Applications*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [9] R. Hermann and A. J. Krener, Nonlinear controllability and observability. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, AC-22(5):728–740, 1977.
- [10] J. Huang, *Nonlinear Output Regulation Theory and Applications*. SIAM Series: Advances in Design and Control, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [11] A. Isidori, *Nonlinear Control Systems II*, Springer Verlag, New York, 1999.
- [12] A. Isidori, L. Praly, L. Marconi, "SICON addendum", *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, submitted, 2008.
- [13] Z. P. Jiang, A. R. Teel, L. Praly, Small-gain theorem, gain assignment and applications. *Proceedings of the 33rd IEEE Conference on Decision and control*, 1994.
- [14] Z. P. Jiang, *Control of Interconnected Nonlinear Systems: A Small-Gain Viewpoint*, Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences Publisher Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2004.
- [15] I. Kanellakopoulos and P.V. Kokotovic and A. S. Morse, A Toolkit for Nonlinear Feedback Design. *Systems & Control Letters*, Vol. 18, pp. 83-92, 1992.
- [16] P. V. Kokotovic, J. O'Reilly and H. K. Khalil, *Singular Perturbation Methods in Control: Analysis and Design*. Academic Press, 1986.
- [17] L. Marconi and Isidori, "A unifying approach to the design of nonlinear output regulators". In C. Bonivento, A. Isidori, L. Marconi, C. Rossi (Eds), "Advances in Control Theory and Applications", *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences*, Springer Verlag Berlin, 2007.
- [18] L. Marconi, L. Praly, A. Isidori, Output Stabilization via Nonlinear Luenberger Observers. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 45, n. 6, pp. 2277-2298, 2007.
- [19] L. Marconi, A. Isidori, L. Praly, Robust Asymptotic Stabilization of Nonlinear Systems with Non-Hyperbolic Zero Dynamics: Part II. submitted, 2008.
- [20] L. Marconi and L. Praly, Essential and redundant internal models in nonlinear output regulation. In A. Astolfi, L. Marconi (Eds), *Analysis and Design of Nonlinear Control Systems*, Springer Verlag Berlin, 2007.

- [21] L. Marconi and L. Praly, Uniform Practical Output Regulation. To appear on IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control, 2008.
- [22] F. Mazenc and L. Praly and W. P. Dayawansa, Global stabilization by output feedback: examples and counterexamples, Vol. 23, n. 2, pp. 119-125, 1994.
- [23] K. Kazantzis and C. Kravaris, Nonlinear observer design using Lyapunov's auxiliary theorem. Systems Control Lett., 34 (1998), pp. 241–247.
- [24] H.K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*. McMillan, 2nd Edition, New York (USA) 1996.
- [25] A. J. Krener and M. Xiao, Erratum: Nonlinear observer design in the Siegel domain. SIAM J. Control Optim., 43 (2004), pp. 377–378.
- [26] A. Pavlov, N. van de Wouw, H. Nijmeijer, *Uniform Output Regulation of Nonlinear Systems A Convergent Dynamics Approach*. Birkhauser, 2005.
- [27] A.R. Teel and L. Praly, Tools for semiglobal stabilization by partial state and output feedback. *SIAM Journal on Control Optimization*, 33, pp. 1443–1485, 1995.
- [28] A.R. Teel and L. Praly, Global stabilizability and observability imply semi-global stabilizability by output feedback. Systems & Control Letters, 22, pp. 313-325, 1994.
- [29] A. R. Teel, A nonlinear small gain theorem for the analysis of control systems with saturations. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 41, pp 1256-1270, 1996.
- [30] A.R. Teel, L. Moreau and D. Nesic, A unified framework for input-to-state stability in systems with two time scales. IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr., 48, pp. 1526–1544, 2003.